

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7, 10-16, 18, and 21-24 are pending in this application.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 11, 12, and 22-24. The changes to the claims made herein do not introduce any new matter.

Claim Objection

In response to the objection to claim 1, Applicant has amended this claim to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the objection to claim 1 be withdrawn.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-5, 7, 11-16, 18, and 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Peleg et al.* (“*Peleg*”) (WO 98/02844). As will be explained in more detail below, the *Peleg* reference does not disclose each and every feature of independent claims 1, 11, 12, and 22-24, as amended herein.

Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to specify that the relative image shift amount is calculated by detecting a shift (u, v) of the target frame image area with respect to the comparison reference frame image area, and calculating a local shift amount ($\Delta u, \Delta v$) as absolute values of a difference between (u, v) and integers closest to (u, v). Support for the changes made to claim 1 can be found in Applicant’s specification at, for example, page 21, lines 21-24.

The local shift amount ($\Delta u, \Delta v$) specified in present claim 1 denotes the shift amount between the pixel lattices shown in Figures 1 and 2 of the subject application. The local shift amount ($\Delta u, \Delta v$) is significantly different from the overlap amount described in the *Peleg* reference because even if the overlap amount in *Peleg* is large, the local shift amount can be either large or small.

If the local shift amount (Δu , Δv) is smaller than a threshold value, the pixel lattices of two images are so close that the synthesizing of these images will not enhance the substantial resolution of the synthesized image. On the other hand, if the local shift amount (Δu , Δv) is larger than the threshold value, the synthesizing of these images will sufficiently enhance the substantial resolution of the synthesized image.

The *Peleg* reference does not disclose the above-discussed features specified in present claim 1. Thus, for at least the foregoing reasons, the *Peleg* reference does not disclose each and every feature of the subject matter defined in present claim 1.

Applicant has amended each of independent claims 11, 12, and 22-24 along the same lines that claim 1 has been amended. As such, the arguments set forth above regarding present claim 1 also apply to present claims 11, 12, and 22-24.

Accordingly, independent claims 1, 11, 12, and 22-24, as amended herein, are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over *Peleg*. Claims 2-5 and 7, each of which ultimately depends from claim 1, and claims 13-16 and 18, each of which ultimately depends from claim 12, are likewise patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over *Peleg* for at least the same reasons set forth above with regard to the applicable independent claim.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 10 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Peleg* in view of *Szeliski et al.* (“*Szeliski*”) (US 5,987,164). Claim 10 depends from claim 1, and claim 21 depends from claim 12. The *Szeliski* reference does not cure the above-discussed deficiencies of the *Peleg* reference relative to the subject matter defined in present claims 1 and 12. Accordingly, claims 10 and 21 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Peleg* in view of *Szeliski* for at least the reason that each of these claims depends from either claim 1 or claim 12.

**U.S. Application No. 10/541,479
Amendment dated July 17, 2009
Response to Final Office Action dated April 17, 2009
(Submitted with RCE)**

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests reexamination and reconsideration of claims 1-5, 7, 10-16, 18, and 21-24, as amended herein, and submits that these claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, issuance of a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at **(408) 749-6902**. If any fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper, then the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. MIPFP137).

Respectfully submitted,
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP



Peter B. Martine
Reg. No. 32,043

**710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200
Sunnyvale, California 94085
Customer Number 25920**